	Case 2:24-cv-02181-DC-JDP Document	t 42 Filed 06/16/25	Page 1 of 2					
1								
2								
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT							
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA							
10								
11	KELLEY COELHO,	No. 2:24-cv-02181-I	OC-JDP (PS)					
12	Plaintiff,							
13	v.	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AND DENYING						
14	MARIE ALVARADO-GIL, et al.,	MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF						
15	Defendants.	(Doc. Nos. 34, 36)						
16								
17	Plaintiff Kelley Coelho is proceeding pro se in this civil action. This matter was referred							
18	to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.							
19	(Doc. No. 35.)							
20	On May 20, 2025, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations							
21	recommending Plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief (Doc. No. 34) be denied. (Doc. No. 36.)							
22	Specifically, the magistrate judge found Plaintiff failed to comply with the court's local rules							
23	applicable to requests for injunctive relief, and her "motion suffers from unreasonable delay"							
24 25	since she "waited nearly nine months after the filing of her original complaint to move for a temporary restraining order." (<i>Id.</i> at 3–4.) The magistrate judge also found Plaintiff's motion to							
25 26	be "substantively defective" because Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief that is "too far removed from							
20 27	the allegations" in her operative first amended complaint. (<i>Id.</i> at 4–5.) Those findings and							
28	recommendations were served on the parties and contained notice that any objections thereto							
-0	1							

	Case 2:24-cv	/-02181-DC-JDP	Document 42	Filed 06/16/25	Page 2 of 2			
1	were to be filed within fourteen (14) days from the date of service. (Id. at 5.) To date, no							
2	objections have been filed, and the time in which to do so has now passed.							
3	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 304, this							
4	court has conducted a de novo review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the							
5	court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper							
6	analysis.							
7	Accordingly,							
8	1. The findings and recommendations issued on May 20, 2025 (Doc. No. 36) are							
9		ADOPTED in full	l;					
10	2. Plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief (Doc. No. 34) is DENIED; and							
11	3.	This matter is refe	erred back to the as	ssigned magistrate ju	udge for further			
12		proceedings.						
13	TT 10	GO ODDEDED						
14		SO ORDERED.		10	00			
15	Dated: <u>Ju</u>	ine 13, 2025		Dena Coggir				
16					s District Judge			
17								
18								
19								
20								
21								
22								
23								
24								
25								
26								
27								
28								